I was a young speech writer at the State Department when she became Secretary of State. I was so thrilled to have that opportunity because here I was an immigrant from Poland when it was a Communist country. Our new Secretary of State was an immigrant from Czechoslovakia, leaving that country under duress with her family when it became a Communist country. I felt a kinship with this extraordinary American, a sense that we saw the world in similar terms.

I saw her in every part of the world stand up for our country, for our values, for our interest. I saw her face down dictators and comfort their victims. I saw her sense of fun.

In 1997, we were on our way to a meeting of the Association of Southeast Asian Nations, ASEAN, in Malaysia, and we learned a couple of days in advance that there was a tradition that every delegation would put on a skit at the end of this diplomatic meeting, something very, very unusual. We heard, furthermore, that the United States had developed a reputation for really sucking at the skit. That was not acceptable to Madeleine Albright.

She was going to go and stand up for democracy in Burma and Cambodia and have a standoff with the Chinese over the South China Sea, but we were also going to win the skit. So she assigned me to write a brand new version of "Don't Cry for me Argentina" from "Evita," which became "Don't Cry for Me ASEANS." We all got up there and performed it, not really knowing what the reaction would be. It was reviewed in Playbill on Broadway. It was such a surprising hit.

We learned something really interesting, in diplomacy you can actually say anything, no matter how sensitive, no matter how potentially offensive to your diplomatic partners around the world, if you make it rhyme and you put it in a song.

So the next year we got even more ambitious, and we went to the Russians, and said, Would you like to do "West Side Story" with us? They said, Yes. So my job over the most stressful week of my life, counting my last two elections, was to negotiate into long hours of the night with the Russian diplomats the jokes that we would make in this four-act production of "West Side Story."

We didn't think that they would do it until the last minute. The night before the performance, at midnight, the foreign minister of Russia, Yevgeny Primakov, who had been the head of their KGB, stumbled in with his aides into Secretary Albright's suite completely drunk, and said, We are ready to rehearse. We knew that we had it.

Those were obviously simpler days, better days, when we could fight with the Russians on all kinds of issues, but still find fellowship and some friendship and some opportunity to laugh together.

Times have changed. When I look at what is happening right now to the

brave people of Ukraine and the evil that Russia has unleashed on them, and so many other terrible things that the government of Vladimir Putin has done in recent years, I thank goodness for what Secretary of State Madeleine Albright did in the 1990s, particularly her role in leading the first expansion of the NATO alliance.

She understood and saw, before most people, that it would be unjust to stay allied with Europe's old democracies, France, Germany, the United Kingdom forever, but Europe's new democracies never, simply because they had once, against their will, had been subjugated by the Soviet Union.

She also saw it would be unwise, in fact reckless, to allow these Eastern European democracies to stay in a gray zone of insecurity, to signal to Russia that it could, in effect, do what it wanted in this zone, that America would not defend these countries.

She said then of NATO expansion that it was basically about expanding the part of Europe where wars do not happen. By making clear that we, the United States, will fight, if necessary, to defend our allies there, we would make the necessity of doing so actually far less likely. She was right.

Not a single member of NATO, old or new, has ever been attacked on European soil to this day. The only countries Russia has attacked are countries that do not have NATO's defense guarantee.

I think one reason she saw these things is because as an immigrant to America, as an immigrant from tyranny, she saw America from the inside but also from the outside. She saw what America means—what the idea of America means to a human rights defender in Burma, to a dissident in China, to a refugee from violence in Kosovo or Bosnia. She comforted so many of those people and convinced them that America was on their side.

She believed America is a special country, indeed, an indispensable country. She understood that our influence in the world comes not just from the example of our power, but from the power of our example at home.

In her last years, when I would see her, she would often tell me that one of her greatest regrets was she never had a chance to run for office. She was jealous of those of us who had worked with her over the years who decided to run for Congress because she understood that we can't do anything for others if we are not safe and strong at home in our own great. American democracy.

Years ago, when I worked for her she gave a commencement address, and I will just close with these words that she spoke: "There is no certain roadmap to success, either for individuals or for generations. Ultimately, it is a matter of judgment, a question of choice. In making that choice, let us remember that there is not a page of American history, of which we are proud, that was authored by a chronic complainer or prophet of despair. We

are doers. We have a responsibility, as others have had in theirs, not to be prisoners of history, but to shape history; a responsibility to fill the role of pathfinder, and to build with others a global network of purpose and law that will protect our citizens, defend our interests, preserve our values, and bequeath to future generations a legacy as proud as the one that we honor today.

"To that mission, I pledge my own best efforts and summon yours."

We pledge our best efforts to that mission here today, and we summon those of everybody who is watching this evening.

Ms. SLOTKIN. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those moving remarks.

As I conclude here, I just want to thank everyone who came to speak, and I feel extremely proud that these remarks and just a taste of the Secretary's legacy will be kept forever in the official RECORD of the people's House.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

ADJOURNMENT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to section 11(b) of House Resolution 188, the House stands adjourned until 10 a.m. tomorrow morning for morning-hour debate and noon for legislative business.

Thereupon (at 8 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 27, 2022, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

NOTICE OF PROPOSED RULEMAKING

U.S. CONGRESS,
OFFICE OF CONGRESSIONAL WORKPLACE
RIGHTS.

Washington, DC, April 26, 2022.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,

Speaker of the House of Representatives, The Capitol, Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Section 203(c)(1) of the Congressional Accountability Act (CAA), 2 U.S.C. 1313(c)(1), requires the Board of Directors of the Office of Congressional Workplace Rights ("the Board") to issue regulations implementing Section 203 of the CAA relating to the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 ("FLSA"), 29 U.S.C. 206 et seq., made applicable to the legislative branch by the CAA. 2 U.S.C. 1313(a)(1).

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C.

Section 304(b)(1) of the CAA, 2 U.S.C. 1384(b)(1), requires that the Board issue a general notice of proposed rulemaking by transmitting "such notice to the Speaker of the House of Representatives and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate for publication in the Congressional Record on the first day of which both Houses are in session following such transmittal."

On behalf of the Board, I am hereby transmitting the attached notice of proposed rule-making to the Speaker of the House of Representatives. I request that this notice be published in the House section of the Congressional Record on the first day on which both Houses are in session following receipt of this transmittal. In compliance with Section 304(b)(2) of the CAA, a comment period